

THE BLACK HOLE MASS AND MAGNETIC FIELD CORRELATION IN AGN: TESTING BY OPTICAL POLARIMETRY

N.A. Silant'ev, M.Yu. Piotrovich, Yu.N. Gnedin* and T.M. Natsvlishvili
Central Astronomical Observatory at Pulkovo, Saint-Petersburg, Russia.

August 19, 2009

Abstract

We consider the integral light polarization from optically thick accretion disks. Basic mechanism is the multiple light scattering on free electrons (Milne's problem) in magnetized atmosphere. The Faraday rotation of the polarization plane changes both the value of integral polarization degree p and the position angle χ . Besides, the characteristic spectra of these values appear. We are testing the known relation between magnetic field of black hole at the horizon B_{BH} and its mass M_{BH} , and the usual power-law distribution inside the accretion disk. The formulae for $p(\lambda)$ and $\chi(\lambda)$ depend on a number of parameters describing the particular dependence of magnetic field in accretion disk (the index of power-law distribution, the spin of the black hole, etc.). Comparison of our theoretical values of p and χ with observed polarization can help us to choose more realistic values of parameters if the accretion disk mechanism gives the main contribution to the observed integral polarization. The main content is connected with estimation of validity of the relation between B_{BH} and M_{BH} . We found for the AGN NGC 4258 that such procedure does not confirm the mentioned correlation between magnetic field and mass of black hole.

Keywords: polarization - magnetic fields - accretion disks - supermassive black holes.

1 Introduction

Recently Zhang et al. (2005) used the observed $\nu L(5100\text{\AA}) - M_{BH}$ correlation to probe magnetic field of black holes harbored in AGNs. Their model uses the assumption that the accretion disk is supplied by the energy injection due to the magnetic coupling (MC) process, and the gravitational dissipation due to accretion. They have modeled the relation $\nu L(5100\text{\AA}) - M_{BH}$ as a function of the spin parameter a/M_{BH} and the magnetic field B_{BH} . Using the observations of $\nu L(5100\text{\AA})$ for 143 AGNs, they obtain the correlation between M_{BH} and B_{BH} of the following form:

$$\log B_{BH}(G) = 9.26 - 0.81 \log \frac{M_{BH}}{M_{\odot}}. \quad (1)$$

According to this formula, for $M_{BH}/M_{\odot} = 10^{11.4}, 10^9$, and 10^8 the magnetic field B_{BH} is equal to 1 G, 100 G, and 630 G, respectively. Note that Zhang et al. (2005) have used the theory of magnetic coupling (see Wang et al. 2002, 2003 and Page & Thorne 1974), which supposed that magnetic

field is poloidal with the dominant vertical component to the accretion disk, i.e. in Eq.(1) is assumed that $B_{BH} \equiv B_{\parallel}$.

Relation (1) differs significantly from the relationship based on the standard accretion disk theory of the inner region (see Shakura and Sunyaev 1973; Novikov and Thorne 1973):

$$B(G) = 10^8 \left(\frac{M_{BH}}{M_{\odot}} \right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{3R_g}{r} \right)^{3/4}, \quad (2)$$

where $R_g = 2GM_{BH}/c^2$ is gravitational radius of a black hole. Eq. (2) is based on the equipartition between the radiation pressure and magnetic pressure at the high accretion rate.

For Shakura-Sunyaev zone (b), where the equipartition between the gas pressure and magnetic pressure occurs, the magnetic field strength is determined by another relation:

$$B(G) = \frac{10^9}{\alpha^{9/20}} \left(\frac{\dot{M}}{\dot{M}_{Edd}} \right)^{2/5} \left(\frac{M_{BH}}{M_{\odot}} \right)^{-9/20} \times \left(\frac{3R_g}{r} \right)^{13/10}, \quad (3)$$

where α is the Shakura-Sunyaev viscosity parameter, $\dot{M}$ and $\dot{M}_{Edd}$ are the ordinary and Eddington accretion rates, respectively.

The typical value of the magnetic field in the optical radiation region $\approx 10^3 R_g$ and for $\alpha = 0.1$ is

$$B(G) \approx 10^6 \left(\frac{\dot{M}}{\dot{M}_{Edd}} \right)^{2/5} \left(\frac{M_{BH}}{M_{\odot}} \right)^{-9/20}. \quad (4)$$

Narayan and Yi (1995) proposed advection-dominated accretion flow (ADAF) model. Their model presents the hot advection-disk solution that does include advection and then dominates the ion energy transfer. In this case a global magnetic field can be presented as

$$B(G) = \frac{6.55 \cdot 10^8}{\alpha^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\dot{M}}{\dot{M}_{Edd}} \right)^{1/2} \times \left(\frac{M_{BH}}{M_{\odot}} \right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{R_g}{r} \right)^{5/4}. \quad (5)$$

The basic goal of our paper is to calculate the spectrum of linear polarization that can be used to determine the magnetic field strength in the region where the optical linear polarization originates. We calculate the degree and position angle of the polarization of radiation scattered in accretion flows (standard accretion disk, ADAF model, etc.). We take into

*E-mail: gnedin@gao.spb.ru

account the Faraday rotation of the polarization plane (see Dolginov et al. 1995; Gnedin and Silant'ev 1997; Gnedin et al. 2006). The comparison with the observational data can allow us to test both the various models of accretion onto a supermassive black hole and also the correlation between black hole mass and magnetic fields in AGNs and QSOs. Below we consider the case of relation (1) in more detail.

2 Polarization from magnetized accretion disks

An accretion disk is one of the basic elements of the structure of accretion flows near supermassive black holes. Since there is no axial symmetry with respect to the line of sight, the integral, scattered by free electrons radiation, emerging from an accretion disk is polarized. The angle of Faraday rotation of a light beam passing through the distance l is described by the expression (see, for example, Dolginov et al. 1995; Gnedin and Silant'ev 1997):

$$\Psi \equiv \frac{1}{2}\delta\tau \cos\theta \simeq 0.4 \left(\frac{\lambda}{1\mu m}\right)^2 \left(\frac{B}{1G}\right) \tau \cos\theta, \quad (6)$$

where τ is Tomson's optical depth of l , λ is the wavelength of the radiation and θ is the angle between the magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ and line of sight $\mathbf{n}$.

$$\delta = \frac{3}{4\pi} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{r_e} \cdot \frac{\omega_B}{\omega} \simeq 0.8\lambda^2(\mu m)B(G) \quad (7)$$

is the Faraday dimensionless depolarization parameter. Here $\omega = 2\pi\nu$ is angular frequency, and $\omega_B = eB/m_e c$ is cyclotron frequency of an electron in a magnetic field, $r_e = e^2/m_e c^2$ is classic electron radius.

The Faraday rotation of the polarization plane in a magnetized accretion disk changes both the integral degree of polarization p and the position angle χ . The spectra of these values acquire the characteristic forms.

Considering optically thick accretion disks we use the solution of the Milne problem. Usually one considers the Milne problem corresponding to sources of thermal radiation being located far from optically thick plane atmosphere. The exact numerical solution of this problem for magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_{\parallel}$ directed along the normal $\mathbf{N}$ to the atmosphere are presented in Agol and Blaes (1996) and in Shternin et al. (2003).

For estimations of magnetic fields in accretion disks we use simple asymptotical formulae (see Silant'ev 2002 and 2005; Gnedin et al. 2006, and Silant'ev et al. 2009). These formulae are valid for arbitrary directions of magnetic field. Firstly we give the asymptotic formulae for Stokes parameters I , Q and U for general case of magnetized and absorbing plasma:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{F}{2\pi J_1} J(\mu), \\ Q &= -\frac{F}{2\pi J_1} \frac{1-g}{1+g} \frac{(1-\mu^2)(1-k\mu+C)}{(1-k\mu+C)^2 + (1-q)^2 \delta^2 \cos^2 \theta}, \\ U &= -\frac{F}{2\pi J_1} \frac{1-g}{1+g} \frac{(1-\mu^2)(1-q)\delta \cos \theta}{(1-k\mu+C)^2 + (1-q)^2 \delta^2 \cos^2 \theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here, F is the radiation flux emerging from the surface of accretion disk, $\mu = \cos i$, i is the angle of inclination of accretion disk, i.e the angle between the outer normal $\mathbf{N}$ to the disk and the direction $\mathbf{n}$ to the observer. The value $J(\mu) = I(\mu)/I(\mu=0)$ describes the angular distribution of escaping radiation intensity, J_1 is the first moment of $J(\mu)$, i.e. the integral from $\mu J(\mu)$ over interval $(0, 1)$. Parameter q is the degree of absorption. Dimensionless parameter C arises in turbulent magnetized plasma (see Silant'ev 2005), and characterizes the new effect - additional extinction of parameters Q and U due to incoherent Faraday rotations in turbulent eddies. Below we present the apparent formula for this parameter. The value k is the root of corresponding characteristic equation. For conservative atmosphere ($q=0$) this parameter is equal to zero. The parameter g characterizes the maximum degree of polarization $p_{max} = (1-g)/(1+g)$, if we take into account only last scattering of non-polarized radiation before escape the surface, neglecting the existence of magnetic field. So. for conservative atmosphere $g = 0.83255$. This corresponds to $p_{max} = 9.14\%$. Remember that the Sobolev - Chandrasekhar value is equal to 11.71%.

The asymptotic formulae (8) suppose that the depolarization parameter δ is large. In this case the terms with parameters Q and U in full system of transfer equations for I , Q and U become very small $\sim 1/\delta$, and they are negligible in the equation for intensity I . As a result, the radiation intensity obeys the separate transfer equation with the Rayleigh phase function (see, in more detail, Silant'ev 1994). The first equation in system (8) presents the exact solution of this equation for the Milne problem. Formulae (8) were obtained in this way.

The numerical values of k , g , J_1 and $J(\mu)$ for various values q are presented in Silant'ev (2002). So, for example, for $q=0.1$ we have $k=0.5232$, $g=0.77129$, $p_{max}=12.91\%$, and for $q=0.2$ the corresponding values are $k=0.70483$, $g=0.70405$ and $p_{max}=17.37\%$. It is known, that the polarization degree in Milne's problem in absorbing atmosphere is greater than in conservative one. So, for atmospheres with $q=0.1$ and $q=0.2$ the p_{max} -values are equal to 20.4% and 28.7%, respectively (see Silant'ev 1980). In these cases the relative contribution of parameters Q and U into the polarization itself is greater than for the case $q=0$ (where this contribution is $\simeq 20\%$). The existence of true light absorption can explain the observed polarization degrees greater than limiting Sobolev - Chandrasekhar value 11.71% for conservative atmosphere. Clearly, the parameter q depends on wavelength. This gives an additional mechanism to explain the wavelength dependence of observed polarization degree $p(\lambda)$ and position angle $\chi(\lambda)$.

Usually one observes the axially symmetric accretion disks as a whole. The observed integral Stokes parameters $\langle Q(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) \rangle$ and $\langle U(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) \rangle$ are described by the azimuthal averaged formulae

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) \rangle &= Q(\mu, 0) \frac{2}{\pi} (1+C-k\mu) \times \\ &\int_0^{\pi/2} d\Phi \frac{(1+C-k\mu)^2 + a^2 + b^2 \cos^2 \Phi}{[(1+C-k\mu)^2 + a^2 + b^2 \cos^2 \Phi]^2 - (2ab \cos \Phi)^2}, \\ \langle U(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) \rangle &= Q(\mu, 0) a \frac{2}{\pi} \times \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\int_0^{\pi/2} d\Phi \frac{(1 + C - k\mu)^2 + a^2 - b^2 \cos^2 \Phi}{[(1 + C - k\mu)^2 + a^2 + b^2 \cos^2 \Phi]^2 - (2ab \cos \Phi)^2}.$$

Here $Q(\mu, 0) = -F(1 - g)(1 - \mu^2)/2\pi J_1(1 + g)(1 - k\mu)$ is the Stokes parameter of scattered non-polarized radiation ($\langle U(\mu, 0) \rangle \equiv 0$) in the classic Milne problem (see Chandrasekhar 1950). The minus sign denotes that the electric field oscillations are parallel to accretion disk plane (it means that the position angle $\chi(\mu, 0) = 0$). Further we denote $p(\mu, 0) \equiv |Q(\mu, 0)|$.

For estimations in conservative atmospheres ($q = 0$) instead of $p(\mu, 0)$ one can use $p_T(\mu)$ - the known value of polarization for non-magnetized atmosphere with Thomson (Rayleigh) scattering, which is presented in Chandrasekhar's book (1950). In this case we can also use small values of parameter δ , because the limiting value for $\delta \ll 1$ is $p_T(\mu)$.

Dimensionless parameters a and b are connected with the parallel (along the normal $\mathbf{N}$ to the disk) $\mathbf{B}_{\parallel}$ and perpendicular $\mathbf{B}_{\perp}$ components of magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_{\parallel} + \mathbf{B}_{\perp}$:

$$a = (1 - q)\delta_{\parallel} \cos i \simeq 0.8(1 - q)\lambda^2(\mu m)B_{\parallel}(G)\mu,$$

$$b = (1 - q)\delta_{\perp} \sin i \simeq 0.8(1 - q)\lambda^2(\mu m)B_{\perp}(G)\sqrt{1 - \mu^2}. \quad (10)$$

Note that the perpendicular magnetic field consists of two mutually perpendicular components $\mathbf{B}_{\perp} = \mathbf{B}_{\rho} + \mathbf{B}_{\varphi}$, where $\mathbf{B}_{\rho}$ is radial (in the plane of a disk) component, and $\mathbf{B}_{\varphi}$ is the azimuthal one.

The mentioned above parameter C , according to Silant'ev (2005), is described by formula:

$$C = (1 - q)\tau_1^{(T)}\langle\delta'^2\rangle f_B \\ = 0.64(1 - q)\tau_1^{(T)}\lambda^4(\mu m)\langle B'^2\rangle f_B/3. \quad (11)$$

Here, $\tau_1^{(T)}$ is the mean Thomson optical length of turbulent eddies, the values δ' and B' denote fluctuating components of corresponding values ($\delta = \delta_0 + \delta'$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_0 + \mathbf{B}'$). In Eqs.(9) and (10) the values $\delta_{\parallel}$, $\delta_{\perp}$, $\mathbf{B}_{\parallel}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\perp}$ are the mean values of corresponding quantities, where, for brevity, we omitted the subscript "zero". The statistical averages $\langle\delta'\rangle = 0$ and $\langle\mathbf{B}'\rangle = 0$. The numerical coefficient $f_B \simeq 1$ is connected with the integral from corresponding correlation function of values B' in neighboring points of turbulent atmosphere.

The observed degree of the light polarization and the position angle are derived from parameters (9) by the usual way. For particular cases of pure normal ($\delta_{\perp} = 0$) and pure perpendicular ($\delta_{\parallel} = 0$) magnetic fields expressions (9) can be derived analytically. For the first case we have:

$$p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) = \frac{p(\mu, 0)}{\sqrt{(1 + C - k\mu)^2 + (1 - q)^2 \delta_{\parallel}^2 \mu^2}}, \\ \tan 2\chi = \frac{(1 - q)\delta_{\parallel} \mu}{1 + C - k\mu}. \quad (12)$$

It is interesting that position angle χ weakly depends on parameter $k\mu < 1$, which characterises true absorption in the atmosphere. For $C \gg 1$ this term can be omitted. In the first equation this term can be also omitted, but the nominator $p(\mu, 0) \equiv p(\mu, q, 0)$ strictly depends on degree of absorption q (see Silant'ev 2002).

For perpendicular magnetic field are there the formulae:

$$p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) = \frac{p(\mu, 0)}{\sqrt{(1 + C - k\mu)^2 + (1 - q)^2 \delta_{\perp}^2 (1 - \mu^2)}} \\ \chi \equiv 0. \quad (13)$$

For pure perpendicular magnetic field the position angle $\chi = 0$ is due to the axial symmetry of the problem. So, the electric wave oscillations in this case occur parallel to the surface of an accretion disk. The case $\chi \neq 0$ can be only realized if there exists some $B_{\parallel}$ component.

The degree of linear polarization p and position angle χ depend on parameters a and b in a fairly complex form. Of course, the magnitude of polarization decreases with the increase of a and b . The numerical calculations demonstrate that the relative polarization degree $p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B})/p(\mu, 0)$ is symmetric function of parameters a and b . The position angles χ do not possess this symmetry. The detailed description of parameters p and χ , and their wavelength dependence is presented in Silant'ev et al. (2009). Note that the radial $\mathbf{B}_{\rho}$ and azimuthal $\mathbf{B}_{\varphi}$ components of the perpendicular magnetic field $\mathbf{B}_{\perp}$ integrally give the same degree of polarization.

As it was mentioned, in Eq. (1) we have $B_{BH} \equiv B_{\parallel}$. In this case we can use more simple expressions following from Eqs.(12) :

$$\frac{p(\mu, 0)}{p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B})} = \frac{(1 - q)\delta_{\parallel} \mu}{\sin 2\chi}, \\ 1 + C - k\mu = \frac{(1 - q)\delta_{\parallel} \mu}{\tan 2\chi}. \quad (14)$$

If we know the inclination angle i , the observed polarization degree $p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B})$ and the position angle χ , then the expressions (14) allow us to know $\delta_{\parallel}$, i.e. the value $B_{\parallel}$, and the value $1 + C - k\mu$ for models of accretion disks with different possible values of degree of absorption q . Note, that increase of $p_T(\mu, q)$ occurs more fast than decrease $(1 - q)$ with growth of parameter q .

3 The correlation between B_{BH} and M_{BH} , and optical polarization of AGNs and QSOs

Using formulae (9), we calculated the polarization degree $p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B})$ and position angle $\chi(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B})$ for the typical parameters of AGNs considered by Zhang et al. (2005). Our calculations assume $M_{BH} = 10^8 M_{\odot}$, inclination angle $i = 60^\circ$, and effective band width with $\lambda_{rest} = 0.55\mu m$.

The first important step is to derive the scale length R_{λ} defined by the radius in the accretion disk where the disk temperature matches the wavelength of the monitoring band. The standard accretion disk (Shakura and Sunyaev 1973) is characterized by effective temperature profile $T_e = T_{BH}(R_H/r)^{3/4}$, where R_H is the black hole horizon radius. There are the series of papers (Koshanek et al. 2006; Poindexter et al. 2008; Morgan et al. 2008), where the semi-empirical method of determination of the accretion disk scale has been developed. The authors used microlensing variability observed for gravitationally lensed quasars to find the accretion disk size, and observed (in rest frame) wavelength

relation. It is very important that the scaling is appeared to be consistent with expectation from the geometrically thin accretion disk model of Shakura and Sunyaev (1973).

Poindexter et al. (2008) have presented the following scaling size-wavelength relation:

$$R_\lambda(\text{cm}) = 0.97 \cdot 10^{10} \left(\frac{\lambda}{1\mu\text{m}} \right)^{4/3} \times \left(\frac{M_{BH}}{M_\odot} \right)^{2/3} \left(\frac{L_{bol}}{\epsilon L_{Edd}} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (15)$$

Here R_λ is the radius in accretion disk that corresponds to the observed effective wavelength λ , L_{bol} is the bolometric luminosity, and $L_{Edd} = 1.3 \cdot 10^{38} (M_{BH}/M_\odot) \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ is the Eddington luminosity, ϵ is the rest-mass radiation conversion efficiency. The commonly accepted relation between the L_{bol} of the accretion disk and the accretion rate $\dot{M}$ is $L_{bol} = \epsilon \dot{M} c^2$.

First of all we estimate the depolarization parameter a from Eq. (10) (the parameter b , in this approximation $B(R_\lambda) \equiv B_\parallel(R_\lambda)$, is equal to zero). We calculate a suggesting the power-law radial dependence of the magnetic field

$$B(R_\lambda) = B_{BH} \left(\frac{R_H}{R_\lambda} \right)^n. \quad (16)$$

The radius of the black hole horizon is (Novikov and Thorne 1973):

$$R_H(\text{cm}) = \frac{GM_{BH}}{c^2} (1 + \sqrt{1 - a_*^2}), \quad (17)$$

where a_* is the spin of the Kerr black hole.

For our calculations we use the fundamental relation between the bolometric luminosity and the mass of a super-massive black hole in AGN (see, for example, McGill et al. 2008; Ziolkowski 2008, Denney et al. 2009). According to Ziolkowski (2008) we have

$$M_{BH}(g) = 5.71 \cdot 10^7 L_{bol}^{0.545 \pm 0.036} (44) M_\odot, \quad (18)$$

where $L_{bol}(44) \equiv L_{bol}/10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Let us remind also the very important relation $L_{bol} = 9 \cdot \lambda L(5100\text{\AA})$, where $L(5100\text{\AA})$ is differential luminosity at $\lambda = 5100\text{\AA}$.

Eqs. (1), and (15)-(18) allow us to obtain the magnetic field $B(R_\lambda)$ for power-law index n :

$$B(R_\lambda) \equiv B_\parallel(R_\lambda) = 10^{9.26 - 2.036n - 0.81s + 0.055sn} \lambda_{rest}^{-4n/3} f_n(a_*), \quad (19)$$

where $s = \log(M_{BH}/M_\odot)$ and

$$f_n(a_*) = \epsilon^{n/3} (1 + \sqrt{1 - a_*^2})^n. \quad (20)$$

The analogous formulae can be derived for other models (see Eqs. (2)-(5)). Note that in all the formulae magnetic fields are taken in Gausses, the radii R_H and R_λ in cm, wavelengths in μm , and mass in grams. To obtain the parameter $\delta_\parallel$ we substitute the formula (16) to first expression in Eq.(10).

The coefficient $f_n(a_*)$ is tabulated in Table 1 for a number of values of parameters ϵ and a_* . In this Table we used the known relation between the spin of the Kerr black hole a_* and the accretion radiation efficiency ϵ (see Tables in Krolik 2007, and Shapiro 2007).

Table 1: The values of the coefficient $f_n(a_*)$.

$a_*; \epsilon$	0; 0.057	0.5; 0.1	1; 0.42	- 0.9; 0.032
$n = 0.5$	0.88	0.93	0.86	0.68
$n = 0.81$	0.81	0.89	0.79	0.53
$n = 1$	0.77	0.87	0.75	0.46
$n = 5/4$	0.72	0.84	0.70	0.37
$n = 3/2$	0.67	0.81	0.65	0.31
$n = 2$	0.59	0.75	0.56	0.21

Table 2: The values of the parameter $\delta_\parallel$.

$a_*; \epsilon$	0; 0.057	0.5; 0.1	1; 0.42	- 0.9; 0.032
$n = 0.5$	30.337	32.182	30.586	23.347
$n = 0.81$	11.463	12.613	11.615	7.500
$n = 1$	6.313	7.104	6.417	3.739
$n = 5/4$	2.880	3.338	2.939	1.496
$n = 3/2$	1.314	1.568	1.346	0.599
$n = 2$	0.273	0.346	0.282	0.096

For the same values of parameters n, ϵ and a_* , as in Table 1, and the values $\lambda_{rest} = 0.55\mu\text{m}$, $M_{BH} = 10^8 M_\odot$, we calculated first the parameter $\delta_\parallel$ (see Eqs. (10)). The results are presented in Table 2. The parameters $\delta_\parallel$ for other wavelengths can be calculated from $\delta_\parallel(\lambda = 0.55\mu\text{m})$ by the simple relation:

$$\delta_\parallel(\lambda_2) = \delta_\parallel(\lambda_1) \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \right)^{2-4n/3}. \quad (21)$$

The Faraday depolarization is not effective if the parameters $\delta_\parallel$ is small, $\delta_\parallel < 1$. From Eq.(1) we see that increase of $s = M_{BH}/M_\odot$ decreases magnetic field $B_\parallel$, i.e. the depolarization parameter $\delta_\parallel$ are to be also decrease. This is confirmed by numerical calculations. So, for $s = 5$ parameter $\delta_\parallel$ lies in the interval (7000 - 40), depending on values n, a_* and ϵ . For $s = 10$ this parameter acquires the values between 1 and 0.01. The largest value of parameter $\delta_\parallel$ corresponds to smallest value of n . The values of $\delta_\parallel$, corresponding to $n = 0.5$, are to 100 - 200 times larger than those, corresponding to $n = 2$. It is clearly, why this occurs. Large n give rise to small values of magnetic fields $B(R_\lambda)$, as compared with those corresponding to small values of n . Dependence of $\delta_\parallel$ on parameters a_* and ϵ is not so drastic as the s and n -dependencies (see Table 2).

After that we assumed the inclination angle of an accretion disk $i = 60^\circ$ and have calculated the parameter a according to relations (10) for conservative and non-turbulent atmosphere ($q = 0, C = 0$). Using Eq. (12), we calculated the polarization degree p and position angle χ . The results of calculations are presented in Table 3. Remember that position angle χ is equal to zero when electric wave oscillations are parallel to the accretion disk plane. Remember also that for $i = 60^\circ$ the polarization degree $p_T(\mu = 0.5)$ is equal to 2.252% (see Chandrasekhar 1950). Our calculations show that for relation (1) the effect of Faraday depolarization acts efficiently in the case of standard accretion disk for $n < 2$. For any distribution of magnetic field with $n \geq 2$ the depolarization is very low, and the polarization parameters correspond to the classic limit $p_T(\mu)$ (Chandrasekhar 1950). This means

Table 3: The values of polarization degree $p\%$, and position angle χ° for inclination angle of an accretion disk $i = 60^\circ$.

a_*, ε	0; 0.057	0.5; 0.1	1; 0.42	- 0.9; 0.032
$n = 0.5$	0.15%; 43°	0.14; 43	0.15; 43	0.19; 43
$n = 0.81$	0.39%; 40°	0.35; 40	0.38; 40	0.58; 38
$n = 1$	0.68%; 36°	0.61; 37	0.67; 36	1.06; 31
$n = 5/4$	1.28%; 28°	1.16; 30	1.27; 28	1.80; 18
$n = 3/2$	1.88%; 17°	1.77; 19	1.87; 17	2.16; 8
$n = 2$	2.23%; 4°	2.22; 5	2.23; 4	2.25; 1

that there is a direct relation between the boundary value of n (where depolarization does not yet occur) and the black hole mass magnitude. So, for $M_{BH} < 10^8 M_\odot$ the strong depolarization exists for $n < 1.5 - 2$ (see Table 3).

The technique of estimation of observed polarization from optically thick magnetized accretion disk, suggested in this section, uses relation (12). If the observed polarization differs strongly from these estimations, it means that formula (12) does not valid, i.e. the assumptions used by Zhang et al. (2005) are also invalid. The same technique can be also used for other models of accretion disk structure. So, the main problem to use this technique is connected with the observation of polarization degree p and position angle χ from AGNs. This is separate, fairly difficult, problem, especially for estimation of position angle χ , and its orientation with respect to accretion disk plane. We do not discuss these problems.

Strictly speaking, our calculations of radiation polarization from the ring of the radius R_λ can be used directly if the gravitational potential GM_{BH}/R_λ in the observed ring is much smaller then that near the vicinity of black hole. The strong gravitational fields near the black holes influences the Stokes parameters of outgoing radiation when it propagate to a distant observer. The detailed calculations of this effect have been made by Connors et al. (1980), and Dovciak et al. (2004). According to these papers, the results of calculations of the Stokes parameters I, Q , and U the local (rest) reference frame in accretion disk are to be integrated along the geodesic paths of photons escaping from every point of the ring R_λ . This integration gives rise to the deformation of the spectrum of radiation (reddening), and to the change in Stokes parameters due to the rotation of polarization plane. What is important is that the degree of polarization does not change its value. As a role, the distance R_λ for optical wavelengths is far from the black hole, and our consideration is valid without the gravitational corrections.

Frequently the constitution of black hole vicinity is more complex than the existence of accretion disk, one can exists some types of radiating jets, toroidal clumpy rings etc. The considered mechanism of light polarization is only one from possible mechanisms. Besides, usually the observed position angles χ are not connected directly with the plane of accretion disk. In this case we are to check that the differences of observed position angles $\chi_{obs}(\lambda_i) - \chi_{obs}(\lambda_j)$ coincide with the corresponding theoretical differences for different wavelengths λ_i and λ_j . This procedure makes the estimation of magnetic field and unknown disk's inclination angle i more distinct then for the single wavelength observation.

3.1 Application of theory to the galaxy NGC 4258

Now, as an example of using our formulae, consider the Seifert II galaxy NGC 4258. It is found that this galaxy has accretion disk (see , for example, Modjaz et al. 2005). The accretion disk has an almost edge on orientation with inclination angle $i \simeq 83^\circ$. In the center there is a black hole with $M_{BH} \simeq 3.9 \cdot 10^7 M_\odot$ (see Herrnstein et al. 1999). The polarized continuum radiation from the nucleus of NGC 4258 was observed by Wilkes et al. (1995). We consider here only observation of continuum polarization at $\lambda \simeq 0.55 \mu\text{m}$. The polarization degree is equal to $p = 0.35 \pm 0.01\%$, and position angle relatively the disk's surface $\chi = 7 \pm 1^\circ$. For conservative atmosphere the polarization $p_T(i = 83^\circ) = 6.9\%$.

Small polarization degree shows that $\delta_\parallel$ are to be great. Indeed, from first Eq.(12), taken for conservative non-turbulent atmosphere, we obtain $\delta_\parallel \simeq 161.56$, that corresponds to $B_\parallel(R_\lambda) = 667.6\text{G}$ and $\delta_\parallel \mu = 19.69$, which gives, according to second Eq.(12), the value $\chi = 43.55^\circ$. This angle is far from observed value 7° . So, it is impossible to explain the observational data , assuming that accretion disk is the conservative non-turbulent atmosphere.

Now, we suppose that accretion disk is turbulent ($C \neq 0$) and conservative medium ($q = 0$). In this case Eqs.(14) give rise to solution: $\delta_\parallel = 39.135$, and $C = 18.129$. Using Eq.(10) and (11), we obtain $B_\parallel(R_\lambda) = 161.7\text{G}$, and $\tau_1^{(T)} \langle B'^2 \rangle \simeq 929$ (for estimation we take $f_B = 1$). We do not know the characteristic dimension of turbulent eddies. If we take $\tau_1^{(T)} = 0.1$, then we obtain $B' = \sqrt{\langle B'^2 \rangle} = 96\text{G}$. For $\tau_1^{(T)} = 0.5$ the value of B' will be to 5 times lesser: $B' \simeq 19\text{G}$. As far as it goes the q -dependence we know that the absorbing atmosphere has more great polarization degree $p_T(\mu)$ that the usual conservative one (see Silant'ev 1980). The term $k\mu$ in Eqs.(1) is small value (remember that $k < 1$ and $\mu = 0.122$). So, according to first Eq.(14), the $\delta_\parallel$ will be greater than that in conservative case. Neglecting small term $k\mu$ in the second Eq.(14), we see that the level of magnetic field fluctuations C also increases its value.

It is important that our value $B_\parallel(R_\lambda) \simeq 161.7\text{G}$ we obtained directly from observational data and our asymptotical formulae (14). We do not use the basic relation (1). The value $B_\parallel(R_\lambda)$ from Eq. (19) was derived with the using this relation. For our case $s = 7.591$, $\lambda = 0.55 \mu\text{m}$, and $B_\parallel(R_\lambda) = 162\text{G}$, Eq. (19) acquires the form:

$$f_n \simeq \frac{B(R_\lambda, q)}{B(R_\lambda, 0)} 0.1254 \cdot 10^{1.2723 n}. \quad (22)$$

For conservative atmosphere and $n = 0.5$ we have $f_{0.5} \simeq 0.54$. For $n = 0.81$ one has $f_{0.81} \simeq 1.34$, for $n = 1$ the corresponding value $f_n \simeq 2.35$. Further, with the increasing n the values f_n increase exponentially. This behavior is opposite to that presented in Table 1. According to Table 1 and definition (20), every values of f_n are equal to 1 at $n = 0$, and then they diminish monotonically with increasing of n . Our values of f_n in Eq.(22), obtained from observational polarization and relation (1), are equal to 0.1254 at $n = 0$, and then they increase very rapidly with increasing n .

This means that for NGC 4258 relation (1) distinctly does not takes place. True absorption increases $\delta_\parallel$ and, correspondingly, the value $B(R_\lambda, q) > B(R_\lambda, 0)$. The absorbing

atmosphere increases the f_n -values in Eq.(22).

Note that, according to selfconsistent model of Pariev et al. (2003), parameters $n < 1$ correspond to gas density of accretion disk which increase with the distance from black hole. It seems fairly unphysically. For $n > 1$, the discrepancy between theoretical f_n from Table 1, and the values (22) is most large. It means that it is necessary to take into account the turbulent magnetic field into accretion disk and its contribution can radically change the relation between magnetic field strength at the horizon of a massive black hole and its mass determined by Zhang et al. (2005).

4 Wavelength dependence of polarization

The most important information on the magnetic field distribution in an accretion disk can be obtained from the wavelength (frequency) dependence of polarization degree and position angle. This dependence follows from Eqs.(12) for the case of pure vertical magnetic field $B_{||}$, and from Eqs.(13) - for the case of perpendicular magnetic field $B_{\perp}$. The expressions for polarization degree in both cases are analogous, but the formulae for position angles are different. According to second Eq.(13) for pure perpendicular magnetic field the spectrum of $\chi(\lambda)$ is almost flat. This is can be used, to some extent, for qualitative characterizing is there great perpendicular magnetic field, as compared with $B_{||}$, or not. In general cases we are to use the numerical calculation of $\langle Q \rangle$ and $\langle U \rangle$ from Eqs.(9). Because absorption degree q depends on wavelength, it is difficult to speak about wavelength dependence of $p(\lambda)$ and $\chi(\lambda)$ in general. For this reason, we restrict ourselves by the case of conservative atmospheres, where $q = 0$ and $k = 0$. Such atmospheres are frequently used in analysis of polarization data.

Remember that parameters $\delta_{||,\perp}$ are proportional to λ^2 , and the turbulent parameter C is proportional to λ^4 . The observed wavelength, according to Wien's displacement law $\lambda = Const/T_e$, is connected with effective temperature T_e . In most used accretion disk model of Shakura & Sunyaev (1973) $T_e \sim r^{-3/4}$. In others models one generally considers $T_e \sim r^{-s}$, where r is distance from black hole. According to these relations, we have $R_{\lambda} \sim \lambda^{1/s}$, where R_{λ} is distance corresponding to emission of λ -radiation. Using Eq.(16) we conclude that $B(R_{\lambda}) \sim \lambda^{-n/s}$. If $\delta_{||,\perp} \gg C > 1$ the polarization degree spectrum is characterized by the following expression

$$p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) \sim \frac{1}{\delta_{||,\perp}} \sim \frac{1}{\lambda^{2-n/s}}. \quad (23)$$

For most used value $s = 3/4$ and $n = 5/4$ (see Pariev et al. 2003), we obtain $p(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-1/3}$. If one exists $C \gg \delta_{||,\perp} > 1$, the $p(\lambda)$ - spectrum is described by another formula:

$$p(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{B}) \sim \frac{1}{C} \sim \frac{1}{\lambda^4 \langle B'^2 \rangle}. \quad (24)$$

We do not know how $\langle B'^2 \rangle$ depends on R_{λ} . One can consider two limiting cases. If $\langle B'^2 \rangle = Const$, then $p(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-4}$. If $\langle B'^2 \rangle \sim B^2$, then $p(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-2(2-n/s)}$, i.e. this is square of spectrum (23). In any case the most sharp dependence, as

compared with Eq.(23), demonstrates that there exists magnetic turbulence.

Now let us say some words about the spectrum of position angle χ . For $C \gg 1$ the second equation (12) acquires the form

$$\tan 2\chi \simeq \frac{\delta_{||}\mu}{C} \sim \frac{\lambda^{-(2+n/s)}}{\langle B'^2 \rangle}. \quad (25)$$

For $\langle B'^2 \rangle = Const$ we obtain from Eq.(25) $\chi(\lambda) \sim \arctan \lambda^{-(2+n/s)}$. This gives for $n = 5/4$ and $s = 3/4$ the expression $\chi(\lambda) \sim \arctan \lambda^{-11/3}$. For second limiting case $B' \sim B_{||}$ we have $\chi(\lambda) \sim \arctan \lambda^{-(2-n/s)}$.

Qualitatively the behavior of position angle χ can be understood from Eq.(12). If $\delta_{||} \gg C > 1$, we have $\tan 2\chi \gg 1$, and $\chi \rightarrow 45^\circ$. In this case $\chi(\lambda)$ does not practically depend on λ . The existence of turbulent extinction C diminishes the position angle. In the limiting case $\chi \ll 1$, we can use the known relation $\tan 2\chi \simeq 2\chi$. In this case Eq.(25) directly presents the spectrum of $\chi(\lambda)$. So, for $\langle B'^2 \rangle \simeq Const$, the position angle $\chi \rightarrow 0$ very rapidly, as $\sim \lambda^{-11/3}$ for $n = 5/4$ and $s = 3/4$. For $B' \sim B_{||}$ the position angle tends to zero slowly, as $\sim \lambda^{-1/3}$ for the same n and s . Note that spectra $p(\lambda)$ and $\chi(\lambda)$ help us to estimate the inclination angle i , as this was explained in paragraph 3.

5 Conclusions

We have showed that the magnetic field strength - the black hole mass correlation can be probed by the optical polarimetric observations. The basic idea of this probe is taking into account Faraday rotation of polarization plane of radiation scattered by free electrons in optically thick accretion disk. Faraday rotation gives rise to partial depolarization of outgoing integral radiation, and to arising of characteristic wavelength spectra of polarization degree and position angle. Both effects are described by two depolarization parameters a and b (see Eqs. (10)) related with normal $B_{||}$ and tangential $B_{\perp}$ components of magnetic field inside an accretion disk. The Faraday effect is stronger if the parameters a and b are greater than unity. In this case there are the simple relation between the power-law index n of magnetic field distribution inside the accretion disk and black hole mass. As a rule, the greater the central black hole mass M_{BH} the lower the power-law index.

For massive $M_{BH} \approx (10^8 - 10^9)M_{\odot}$ one should expect the polarization degree corresponding to classic electron scattering without noticeable Faraday depolarization. Only for extremely smooth ($n \leq 1$) magnetic field distribution one can expect a display of depolarization effects. For low massive $M_{BH} \approx (10^5 - 10^6)M_{\odot}$ black holes the depolarization effects can be displayed even for steep distribution of magnetic field $n \geq 1.5 - 2$.

As an example of application of presented theory we considered the AGN NGC 4258, where is found the accretion disk, which certainly plays the main role in polarization emission in continuum. It was found that for this source the basic relation (1) between magnetic field and the mass of black hole does not takes place. This negative result gives rise to basic question for what sources the correlation relation (1) really exists and why.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Grant of President of Russian Federation “The Basic Scientific Schools”, NS-61110.2008.2, by FEBR (Project No. 07-02-00535a), Program of Prezidium of RAS, the Program of the Department of Physical Sciences of RAS. M.Yu.Piotrovich acknowledges the Council of Grants of President of Russian Federation for Young Scientists, grant No. 4101.2008.2.

References

- [1] Agol, E. & Blaes, O., 1996, MNRAS, 282, 965
- [2] Chandrasekhar, S., 1950, Radiative transfer, (Clarendon press, Oxford)
- [3] Connors, P. A., Piran, T., Stark, R. E., 1980, ApJ, 235, 224
- [4] Dolginov, A.Z., Gnedin, Yu. N., Silant’ev, N. A., 1995, Propagation and polarization of radiation in cosmic media, Gordon&Breach, N.Y.
- [5] Denney, K. D., Peterson, B. M., Dietrich, M., Vestergaard, M., Bentz, M. C., 2009, Ap.J, 692, 246 2008, (astro-ph 0810.3234)
- [6] Dovciak, M., Karas, V., Matt, G., 2004, MNRAS, 355, 1005
- [7] Gnedin, Yu. N. & Silant’ev, N. A., 1997, Basic Mechanisms of Light Polarization in Cosmic Media (Hartwood, Amsterdam)
- [8] Gnedin, Yu. N., Silant’ev, N. A. & Shternin, P. S., 2006, Astron.Lett., 32, 3
- [9] Herrnstein, J. R., Moran, J. M., Greenhill, L. J., et al., 1999, Nature, 400, 539
- [10] Kochanek, C. S., Dai, X., Morgan, C., Morgan, N. & Poindexter, S., 2006, astro-ph/0609112
- [11] Krolik, J. H., 2007, arXiv:0709.1489
- [12] McGill, K. L., Woo, J-H., Treu, T., Malkan, M. A., 2008, ApJ, 673, 70
- [13] Modjaz, M., Moran, J. M., Kondratko, P. T., Greenhill, L. J., 2005, ApJ, 626, 104
- [14] Morgan, C. W., Kochanek, C. S., Dai, X., Morgan N. D. & Falco, E. E., 2008, ApJ, 689, 755 (arXiv: 0802.1210)
- [15] Narayan, R. & Yi, I., 1994, ApJ, 428, L13
- [16] Novikov, I. D. & Thorne, K., 1973, Black Holes, ed. C. De Witt-Morette & B. C. De Witt, (Gordon and Breach, New York)
- [17] Pariev, V. I., Blackman, E. C., Boldyrev, S. A., 2003, A&A, 407, 403
- [18] Poindexter, S., Morgan, N. & Kochanek, C. 2008, ApJ, 673, 34
- [19] Shakura, N. I. & Sunyaev, R. A., 1973, A&A, 24, 337
- [20] Shapiro, S., 2007, arXiv: 0711.1537 (astro/ph)
- [21] Shternin, P. S., Gnedin, Yu. N. & Silant’ev, N. A., 2003, Astrofizika, 46, 433
- [22] Silant’ev, N. A., 1980, SvA, 24, 341
- [23] Silant’ev, N. A., 1994, JQSRT, 52, 207
- [24] Silant’ev, N. A., 2002, A&A, 383, 326
- [25] Silant’ev, N. A., 2005, A&A, 433, 1117
- [26] Silant’ev, N. A., 2007, Astronomy Reports, 51, 67
- [27] Silant’ev, N. A., Piotrovich, M. Yu., Gnedin, Yu. N., Natsvlshvili, T. M., 2009, A&A (accepted)
- [28] Wilkes, B. J., Schmidt, G. D., Smith, P.S., et al., 1995, ApJ, 455, L13
- [29] Zhang, W. M., Lu, Y. & Zhang, S. N., 2005, Chin. J. Astron. Astrophys., 5, 347 (astro-ph/0501365)
- [30] Ziolkowski, J., 2008, Chin. J. Astron. Astrophys., Vol.8, Supplement, 273-280. (arXiv:0808.0435)